Rebuttal Testimony of Karen Stewart Qwest Corporation Docket No. 07-2263-03 Qwest Exhibit 3R.2

1	BEFORE THE WASH	ING	TON STATE						
2	UTILITIES AND TRANSPO	RTA	TION COMMISSION						
3	In the Matter of the Petition	)							
	for Arbitration of an	)	DOCKET NO. UT-063061						
4	Interconnection Agreement	)							
	between	)	Volume V						
5		)	Pages 84 to 292						
	QWEST CORPORATION	)							
6		)							
	and	)							
7		)							
	ESCHELON TELECOM, INC.	)							
8		)							
	Pursuant to 47 U.S.C.	)							
9	Section 252(b).	)							
		_)							
10									
11	A hearing in the above matter was held on								
12	May 8, 2007, from 9:30 a.m to 3:40 p.m., at 1300								
13	South Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 206, Olympia,								
14	Washington, before Administrative Law Judge PATRICIA								
15	CLARK.								
16	The parties were present as follows:								
17	QWEST CORPORATION,	bу	JASON D. TOPP, Attorney						
	at Law, 200 South Fifth Stree	t,	Room 2200, Minneapolis,						
18	Minnesota 55402, Telephone (612) 672-8905, Fax (612)								
	672-8911, E-Mail jason.topp@q	wes	t.com.						
19									
	QWEST CORPORATION,	by	JOHN M. DEVANEY,						
20	Attorney at Law, PERKINS COIE	LI	P, 607 Fourteenth Street						
	Northwest, Washington, D.C. 2	000	5, Telephone (202)						
21	434-1624, Fax (202) 434-1690, E-Mail								
	JDevaney@perkinscoie.com.								
22									
23									
24	Joan E. Kinn, CCR, RPR								
25	Court Reporter								

- 1 I'm going to ask you to refer to your direct testimony,
- which is Exhibit 62, at pages 134 and 135.
- 3 A. Okay.
- Q. And I'm only asking you to keep those pages
- 5 in front of you because they set forth the parties'
- 6 competing ICA proposals for this particular issue, so it
- 7 may be useful to refer to that language as we go through
- 8 this line of questions. As the language shows, both
- 9 parties, Eschelon and Qwest, have used language that
- 10 would require Qwest to provide moving, adding,
- 11 repairing, and changing with respect to UNEs; is that
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. And a key difference between the parties'
- proposals is, as Ms. Stewart discussed this morning,
- 16 Eschelon's proposing the use of access to unbundled
- 17 network elements includes these various activities; is
- that one key difference?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And a second key difference between the
- 21 parties' positions is that Qwest is proposing as shown
- on page 135 of Exhibit 62 that those activities will be
- performed "at the applicable rate"; is that correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. And as I understand it from our recent case

Rebuttal Testimony of Karen Stewart

Qwest Corporation
Docket No. 07-2263-03

Qwest Exhibit 3R.2

L	in	Colorado,	it's	your	view	that	the	terms	moving,
---	----	-----------	------	------	------	------	-----	-------	---------

- 2 adding, repairing, and changing potentially involve
- 3 thousands of activities; is that correct?
- A. Yes, I think I probably did say that. I
- 5 think what I said was that -- I think what I actually
- 6 said was that it could encompass even thousands of
- 7 activities depending upon because the network is dynamic
- 8 and complicated, and as you repair or maintain, it was
- 9 difficult to provide a single list of all activities
- 10 that it might encompass.
- 11 Q. And it's also your view, is it not, that
- those terms include activities that aren't known today
- and that could be changed in the future?
- 14 A. Yes, I think that is true, though I think
- 15 those would be limited.
- O. And it's Eschelon's position that these
- thousands of activities and activities that we don't
- 18 know about today but could emerge in the future, all of
- them should be provided at cost based TELRIC rates; is
- 20 that correct?
- 21 A. I think it is correct, though I might take
- 22 issue with the way you asked your question. The
- 23 underlying principle here is, as I did describe in
- 24 Colorado, is the notion of non-discrimination, that
- 25 these issues, while perhaps many, are defined by the way